



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

07/888,857 05/27/92 KWAK

H P53521

FRAHME EXAMINER

E1M1/0516

ROBERT E. BUSHNELL
LEVY, BUSHNELL, ZITO & GRANDINETTI
1511 K ST., N.W.
STE. 425
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2108

10

DATE MAILED: 05/16/94

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☒ Responsive to communication filed on 2-23-94 ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), — days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152. |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-38 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.

3. ☒ Claims 23-33 are allowed.

4. ☒ Claims 1-22 and 34-38 are rejected.

5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.

6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. ☒ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).

10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner. ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. ☒ The proposed drawing correction, filed on 1-8-93, has been ☒ approved. ☐ disapproved (see explanation).

12. ☒ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☒ been received ☐ not been received
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____

13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit: 2108

1. The drawings are objected to because Figure 3 is not designated by a legend such as "Prior Art". The legend is necessary in order to clarify what applicant's invention is. MPEP § 608.02(g). Correction is required.
2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format of an Abstract of the Disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 250 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 250 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said", should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The recitation of "means" in lines 4 and 6 is improper.

3. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.
4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The description of figures 1-3 of a conventional

Art Unit: 2108

color video printer at pages 3-8 of the detailed description of the invention section of the specification should be in the "background of the invention" section. Appropriate correction is required.

6. Claims 1-22 and 34-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 lines 6-11 are indefinite because it is not clear what the differences are between the memory means, the means comprising internal memory means, and the internal memory means. Also, the functions of these plural means do not clearly correspond.

Claim 2 line 3, "read-from" is indefinite.

Claim 4, "further comprised of said raster scan being representative" is indefinite and idiomatically incorrect. "further comprised of" should be --wherein--, and the original claim language of lines 2 and 3 should be reinstated to correct the problem.

Claim 5 line 1, "operative to" is indefinite.

Claim 7, the relationship between "input video data" of claim 7 and the first and/or second data of claim 1 is ambiguous.

Claim 8, "further comprised of" is confusing and should be --wherein--.

Art Unit: 2108

Claim 9 line 5, the "means for storing...,reading...,accomodating..., applying..., and enabling..." is indefinite because it is not supported by recitation in the claim of sufficient structure to accomplish the function;

line 6, "accomodating" is indefinite.

Claim 10 lines 3-4 are indefinite for a failure to recite the cooperational relationship of the internal memory and the plural means of lines 3-4.

Claim 15 lines 3-4, "the displaying means" lacks antecedent basis and a corresponding function.

Claim 17 line 11, "said chrominance signals" lacks proper antecedent basis;

line 13, "a converted said sync signal" has improper antecedent basis;

lines 14-15, "a converted chrominance components" and "converted external color signals" have improper antecedent basis;

there is no cooperational relationship between the first, second, and third selection signals, the mode singal, and the color video printer.

Claim 18, there is no cooperational relationship between the recording mode, printing mode, and monitoring made signals, and the color video printer.

Serial Number: 07/888,857

-5-

Art Unit: 2108


It is suggested that the control means of claims 17 and 18 be inserted into the claims to provide an interrelationship of elements.

7. The term(s) in claim 10 lines 3, 4, and 7 - data conversion, printing address generating, recording address generating, and control are used to modify the word "means", thus purporting to conform to 35 USC 112, sixth paragraph. However, 35 USC 112, sixth paragraph, requires that the term(s) specify a function to be performed, thus enabling a determination of the structural equivalent thereof.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric Frahm whose telephone number is (703) 308-1317.



EF
April 29, 1994



BENJAMIN R. FULLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 218